


Supplementary Table 3. Forest Plots and Doi Plots of Pooled Effect Sizes



Supplementary Table 3. (Continued)

Bullying	Factors	Forest plots	Doi plots																														
(5) Restricted, repetitive patterns of behavior, interests, or activities		<p>Study: Adams et al., 2014; Nowell et al., 2014; Storch et al., 2012</p> <p>Overall: <math>Q=15.48, p=0.00, I^2=87\%</math></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Study</th> <th>Corr (95% CI)</th> <th>% Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Adams et al., 2014</td> <td>0.43 (-0.18, 0.63)</td> <td>32.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nowell et al., 2014</td> <td>-0.25 (-0.45, -0.02)</td> <td>34.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Storch et al., 2012</td> <td>0.13 (-0.13, 0.37)</td> <td>33.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>0.11 (-0.29, 0.47)</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight	Adams et al., 2014	0.43 (-0.18, 0.63)	32.7	Nowell et al., 2014	-0.25 (-0.45, -0.02)	34.1	Storch et al., 2012	0.13 (-0.13, 0.37)	33.2	Overall	0.11 (-0.29, 0.47)	100.0	<p>LFK index: 0.16 (No asymmetry)</p>															
Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight																															
Adams et al., 2014	0.43 (-0.18, 0.63)	32.7																															
Nowell et al., 2014	-0.25 (-0.45, -0.02)	34.1																															
Storch et al., 2012	0.13 (-0.13, 0.37)	33.2																															
Overall	0.11 (-0.29, 0.47)	100.0																															
(6) Externalizing symptoms		<p>Study: Adams et al., 2016; Fink et al., 2017; Hebron et al., 2014; Rieffe et al., 2012; Storch et al., 2012; Zablosky et al., 2013</p> <p>Overall: <math>Q=162.43, p=0.00, I^2=97\%</math></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Study</th> <th>Corr (95% CI)</th> <th>% Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Adams et al., 2016</td> <td>0.64 (0.47, 0.77)</td> <td>15.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fink et al., 2017</td> <td>0.49 (-0.01, 0.98)</td> <td>16.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hebron et al., 2014</td> <td>0.57 (0.51, 0.61)</td> <td>1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rieffe et al., 2012</td> <td>0.59 (0.40, 0.73)</td> <td>15.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Storch et al., 2012</td> <td>0.22 (-0.04, 0.45)</td> <td>15.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zablosky et al., 2013</td> <td>0.08 (0.02, 0.14)</td> <td>17.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>0.44 (0.18, 0.65)</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight	Adams et al., 2016	0.64 (0.47, 0.77)	15.9	Fink et al., 2017	0.49 (-0.01, 0.98)	16.8	Hebron et al., 2014	0.57 (0.51, 0.61)	1.8	Rieffe et al., 2012	0.59 (0.40, 0.73)	15.9	Storch et al., 2012	0.22 (-0.04, 0.45)	15.8	Zablosky et al., 2013	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)	17.9	Overall	0.44 (0.18, 0.65)	100.0	<p>LFK index: 4.48 (Major asymmetry)</p>						
Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight																															
Adams et al., 2016	0.64 (0.47, 0.77)	15.9																															
Fink et al., 2017	0.49 (-0.01, 0.98)	16.8																															
Hebron et al., 2014	0.57 (0.51, 0.61)	1.8																															
Rieffe et al., 2012	0.59 (0.40, 0.73)	15.9																															
Storch et al., 2012	0.22 (-0.04, 0.45)	15.8																															
Zablosky et al., 2013	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)	17.9																															
Overall	0.44 (0.18, 0.65)	100.0																															
Victimization																																	
(7) Internalizing symptoms		<p>Study: Adams et al., 2014; Adams et al., 2016; Fink et al., 2017; Rieffe et al., 2012; Storch et al., 2012; van Schalkwyk et al., 2017; Weiss et al., 2015; Zablosky et al., 2013</p> <p>Overall: <math>Q=54.98, p=0.00, I^2=85\%</math></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Study</th> <th>Corr (95% CI)</th> <th>% Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Adams et al., 2014</td> <td>0.73 (0.57, 0.83)</td> <td>10.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adams et al., 2016</td> <td>0.35 (0.11, 0.55)</td> <td>10.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fink et al., 2017</td> <td>0.16 (-0.02, 0.33)</td> <td>12.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rieffe et al., 2012</td> <td>0.19 (-0.06, 0.42)</td> <td>10.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Storch et al., 2012</td> <td>0.19 (-0.07, 0.42)</td> <td>10.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>van Schalkwyk et al., 2017</td> <td>0.40 (0.24, 0.56)</td> <td>8.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weiss et al., 2015</td> <td>0.45 (0.28, 0.59)</td> <td>11.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zablosky et al., 2013</td> <td>0.17 (0.11, 0.22)</td> <td>13.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>0.37 (0.22, 0.51)</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight	Adams et al., 2014	0.73 (0.57, 0.83)	10.3	Adams et al., 2016	0.35 (0.11, 0.55)	10.7	Fink et al., 2017	0.16 (-0.02, 0.33)	12.1	Rieffe et al., 2012	0.19 (-0.06, 0.42)	10.8	Storch et al., 2012	0.19 (-0.07, 0.42)	10.6	van Schalkwyk et al., 2017	0.40 (0.24, 0.56)	8.3	Weiss et al., 2015	0.45 (0.28, 0.59)	11.8	Zablosky et al., 2013	0.17 (0.11, 0.22)	13.9	Overall	0.37 (0.22, 0.51)	100.0	<p>LFK index: 4.83 (Major asymmetry)</p>
Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight																															
Adams et al., 2014	0.73 (0.57, 0.83)	10.3																															
Adams et al., 2016	0.35 (0.11, 0.55)	10.7																															
Fink et al., 2017	0.16 (-0.02, 0.33)	12.1																															
Rieffe et al., 2012	0.19 (-0.06, 0.42)	10.8																															
Storch et al., 2012	0.19 (-0.07, 0.42)	10.6																															
van Schalkwyk et al., 2017	0.40 (0.24, 0.56)	8.3																															
Weiss et al., 2015	0.45 (0.28, 0.59)	11.8																															
Zablosky et al., 2013	0.17 (0.11, 0.22)	13.9																															
Overall	0.37 (0.22, 0.51)	100.0																															
(8) Inclusive setting		<p>Study: Chiu et al., 2018; Nowell et al., 2014; Rose et al., 2015a; Rowley et al., 2012; Zablosky et al., 2013</p> <p>Overall: <math>Q=117.81, p=0.00, I^2=97\%</math></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Study</th> <th>Corr (95% CI)</th> <th>% Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chiu et al., 2018</td> <td>0.23 (-0.09, 0.09)</td> <td>21.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nowell et al., 2014</td> <td>0.23 (0.00, 0.44)</td> <td>19.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rose et al., 2015a</td> <td>0.19 (-0.07, 0.43)</td> <td>18.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rowley et al., 2012</td> <td>0.84 (0.76, 0.89)</td> <td>19.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zablosky et al., 2013</td> <td>0.16 (0.10, 0.21)</td> <td>21.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>0.34 (0.05, 0.58)</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight	Chiu et al., 2018	0.23 (-0.09, 0.09)	21.1	Nowell et al., 2014	0.23 (0.00, 0.44)	19.2	Rose et al., 2015a	0.19 (-0.07, 0.43)	18.6	Rowley et al., 2012	0.84 (0.76, 0.89)	19.8	Zablosky et al., 2013	0.16 (0.10, 0.21)	21.4	Overall	0.34 (0.05, 0.58)	100.0	<p>LFK index: 3.10 (Major asymmetry)</p>									
Study	Corr (95% CI)	% Weight																															
Chiu et al., 2018	0.23 (-0.09, 0.09)	21.1																															
Nowell et al., 2014	0.23 (0.00, 0.44)	19.2																															
Rose et al., 2015a	0.19 (-0.07, 0.43)	18.6																															
Rowley et al., 2012	0.84 (0.76, 0.89)	19.8																															
Zablosky et al., 2013	0.16 (0.10, 0.21)	21.4																															
Overall	0.34 (0.05, 0.58)	100.0																															

Supplementary Table 3. (Continued)

